

Letter to Christopher Hitchens

Robert Faurisson

October 5, 1994

to Christopher Hitchens
Washington, DC

Dear Sir,

Thanks to my friend Andrew Gray, I got your article on our meeting in a Washington D.C. restaurant on August 29 ("Minority Report", *The Nation*, October 3, 1994, p. 335).

Your article implies that I am some sort of "a convinced Flat Earther". You say that, for me, "the whole story" of a "fact" is a "fable". I am presented as someone who would believe in the Nazi gas chambers if I were shown, *inter alia*, "a surviving authentic model" or a "relic". You claim that you answered my questions but that I did not answer yours. You say that another revisionist, David Irving, at least "concedes" some facts and at least "takes very seriously" a specific "testimony" of a German general, which is not the case of Faurisson. You add that I am "contemptuous of Irving as a historian". You find suspicious the fact that I had no memory of something he had said about Madagascar and the Jews. You say that our judgement is distorted because we have been (we are no more ?) subjected to a lot of stupid censorship and harassment "and it has been known for persecution to distort judgement". Censorship and harassment were exercised in the past. Faurisson is not to be counted among the "overt Neo-Nazis". You "judge" (*sic*) that he "is not of this company". In a way he is worse : "He just doesn't think that Nazism was such a big deal to begin with."

The title of your article is "Minority Report". It implies, once you have read the article, that we Revisionists, we are to be regarded today ONLY as a minority who is wrong whereas the majority is right. Quite in accordance with the article, the little illustration shows Faurisson like an old blind fool of a Nazi trampling skulls and bones of burnt bodies. The weapon of that "brisk" >Nazi : a bit, fat, *sharp* pencil.

When we invited you at that restaurant in Washington, you immediately presented yourself as a British and a Jew.

You are wrong implying that I am some sort of "a convinced Flat Earther". The comparison cannot be valid, and that for historical and chronological reasons, since the Flat Earthers came first and since, afterwards, the Flat Earth theory was revised. Galileo Galilei was a revisionist. At that time, smart people (who, as you know, were the majority) decided that the minority was wrong and they knew the real motive of Galileo Galilei : he was against the Christians and the Christian truth. Today, smart people (who, as you may suspect, are still the majority) decide that the Revisionist minority is wrong and that they know our real motive : we are against the Jews and the Jewish truth. But, instead of analyzing "motives", it is better to begin with the beginning and to analyze "facts". Did Galileo Galilei have the facts right ? Do we, the Revisionists, have the facts right ? *Hic lepus jacet* ; in other words ; "That s THE question."

You are wrong when you describe me asking, *inter alia*, for "a surviving authentic model" or a "relic". My challenge, which seems to embarrass so many people since March 1992, is : "Show me or draw me a Nazi gas chamber !" Why didn't you give those nine words to your readers ? As you know, for anyone knowing the context, we could put it in a four word sentence : "bring me the pudding !" You say you "have seen small-scale crematoria in camp museums in Germany." Of course, this is not an answer and I suppose you realized it was not, since you put it in a parenthesis. but didn't you see more in Germany ? Didn't you see, as well as millions of tourists, at least one so-called "gas chamber" ? And what about the Holocaust Museum in Washington where you live ? What do you think of those ?

You are wrong when you say that I did not answer your questions. Reread your paper and see your four questions : "Is it not true...?", "Is it not the case...?", "Further [...] were the Jews...?" and "Why did so few of them return ?" Every time I told you : "So what ? This does not bring us even the beginning of a Nazi gas chamber." You are right when you say that I remained polite but that I got "distant" and "bored" : it was not THE question. !

About David Irving, you are also wrong.. I am not "contemptuous of Irving as a historian". I say that he had not studied the "Holocaust" matter. I also say that he is a "reluctant revisionist". He was and he is "subjected to a lot of [scandalous] censorship and harassment" for his writings. He does not want to be assimilated to Faurisson, "the Devil" as he put it. He tries his best to keep some distance although he is on our side. Do you really think he believes what he said on Generalmajor Walther Bruns (on Eichmann, on Goebbels, on the gas chambers being an invention of the British (!) propaganda) ? Let me take the example of Bruns. In November 1991, when I was at Irving's home in London, I made him aware, thanks to his own documents that I had asked him to look at, that Bruns' "confession" (?) was typical of the "confessions" collected by the British : it was the usual stereotypes. I showed him what, in another document, the

British had said about Bruns : he "had been relieved of his command" by the Germans, he was an "antinazi" and he was "eager to cooperate with the Allies". Now, guess what D. Irving told me then spontaneously : "Anyway, later on, at a trial, Bruns said that he had in fact not been an eyewitness." Draw your own conclusions.

You say : [...] oddly for a man with such insistence on detail [Faurisson] has no memory of Irving 's Madagascar statement." You are right. I had no memory. Even now, I do not remember having said anything about that statement, in our restaurant. "Insistence on detail" is one thing ; "memory", alas, is another thing. I apologize. I hope you know that even many Zionists agreed with the "Madagascar Plan" (even before the war and even with the possible agreement of the French Government).

Where did you take that I deny massacres of Jews ? See the enclosure (the chart I used at the 1988 Zündel trial).

Be careful when you use the words "Final Solution" ! What do you mean by its "scope and magnitude" ? What is "the whole story" ? Isn't the Jewish soap story a part of "the whole story" ? And the Höss confession, another part ? You say that those two stories "have been debunked". but you do not say by whom they have been "debunked" ? Is it not partly by Faurisson ? You told me you have been very impressed by my article on "How the British obtained the confessions of Rudolf Höss [...]." You had the opportunity of revealing this to the readers of *Nation*. Why didn't you do it ?

One day, the Jews (i.e. the Jewish organizations and Jewish authors) will say that the Nazi gas chambers were a fiction. They will call it a Nazi lie, or a Polish lie, or a Communist lie. Some Jews already had the chutzpah to say such things for the "Jewish soap story" and for the story of the "Four Million Dead in Auschwitz". Of course, they will maintain their religion of the "Holocaust" and will keep accusing the Revisionists of being ugly people since they do not care or do not seem to care for the "uniqueness" (!) of the Jewish tragedy.

During the new "Thirty Years War" (1914-1945), there was indeed a Jewish tragedy but among many other tragedies. The German and the Chinese tragedies were, and still are, perhaps the worst. Not being a Judeocentrist, I am not a Nazicentrist. Judeocentrism is a kind of illness ; Revisionism is a kind of Judeotherapy.

Enclosure : 1988 chart

WHAT *REALLY* HAPPENED TO THE JEWS ?

They Suffered:

SPECIFIC MEASURES

(*EQUALS PERSECUTIONS*)

WAR

INTERNMENT

DEPORTATION

TRANSIT CAMPS

CONCENTRATION CAMPS

LABOUR CAMPS

GHETTOS

DISEASES

EXECUTION OF HOSTAGES

REPRISALS, MASSACRES

NB (1994) Other groups or nations suffered and are still suffering MORE ! History of mankind is awful (and wonderful).

+++++

First displayed on aaargh: 17 April 2001.

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[\[email protected\]](#)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in those places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

[\[email protected\]](#)

| [Accueil général](#) | [Homepage English](#) | [Faurisson Archive](#) | [Archive Faurisson](#) |

You downloaded this document from <<http://aaargh-international.org/engl/FaurisArch/RF941005.html>>